



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

CH

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,788	03/26/2004	Tsvetelina Todorova	6570P067	5219
8791	7590	01/25/2007	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN			ORR, HENRY W	
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD				
SEVENTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			2176	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/813,788	TODOROVA ET AL.
Examiner	Henry Orr	Art Unit 2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 August 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application communication filed March 26, 2004.
2. Claims 1-32 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 21 and 27 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description:
 - a) Ref. #204 in Figure 2
 - b) Ref. #600 in Figure 6
 - c) Ref. #1060 in Figure 10
 - d) Ref. #1236 in Figure 12

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be

notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because

- a) Reference character “408” has been used to designate both CCMS Connector in Figure 2 and Managed Bean Server in Figure 4.
- b) Reference character “710” has been used to designate both Managed Beans in Figure 7 and Remote Connector in Figure 7.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- a) On p. 14 par. 23, applications Ref.# 540 should be replaced with Ref.# 504.
- b) On p. 36 par. 80, naming service node Ref.# 126 should be replaced with Ref.# 1236 according to Figure 12.
- c) On p. 39 par. 91, pull-down menu Ref.# 1424 should be replaced with Ref.# 1426 according to Figure 14.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. **Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of the claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to abstract ideas that are not tied to a technological art, environment, or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims considered to be Non-functional Descriptive Material are not statutory even if in combination with a physical medium. see MPEP § 2106**

Regarding independent claim 11, the preamble in the claim recites “monitoring system graphical user interface”, which appears to recite a system but the components of the system are merely abstract ideas of a graphical user interface. No

computer-readable medium or other hardware is positively recited to establish a statutory category or enable any functionality of the recited descriptive material to be realized.

Dependent claims 12-20 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of base claim 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. **Claims 3-10, 14, 17, 18-20, 22-26 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claims 3, 8 and 9 recite the phrase “an indication”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims because it is unclear whether “an indication” in claims 3, 8 and 9 is referring to previously recited “an indication” in base claim 1.

Claims 3 and 9 recite the phrase “a monitor tree node”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because it is unclear whether “a monitor tree node” in claims 3 and 9 is referring to previously recited “the monitor tree node” in base claim 1.

Claim 8 recites the phrase “the monitor tree node”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because it is unclear whether “the

monitor tree node" in claim 8 is referring to previously recited "**the selected monitor tree node**" in base claim 3.

Claims 14, 17, 18, 19 and 20 recite the phrase "**the monitor tree node**". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims because it is unclear whether "**the monitor tree node**" in claims 14, 17, 18, 19 and 20 is referring to previously recited "**the selected monitor tree node**" in base claim 13.

Claims 22 and 26 recite the phrase "**an indication**". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims because it is unclear whether "**an indication**" in claims 22 and 26 is referring to previously recited "**an indication**" in base claim 21.

Claim 22 recites the phrase "**a monitor tree node**". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because it is unclear whether "**a monitor tree node**" in claim 22 is referring to previously recited "**the monitor tree node**" in base claim 21.

Claim 26 recites the phrase "**the monitor tree node**". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because it is unclear whether "**the monitor tree node**" in claim 26 is referring to previously recited "**the selected monitor tree node**" in base claim 22.

Claims 28 and 31 recite the phrase "**an indication**". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims because it is unclear whether "**an indication**" in claims 28 and 31 is referring to previously recited "**an indication**" in base claim 27.

Claims 28 and 31 recite the phrase “**a monitor tree node**”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because it is unclear whether “**a monitor tree node**” in claims 28 and 31 is referring to previously recited “**the monitor tree node**” in base claim 27.

Dependent claims 4-8, 10, 19, 20, 23-26, 29, 30 and 32 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 1-5, 7, 11-14, 21-24 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanchett, U.S. Patent # 6,834,301 B1, in view of Melillo, U.S. Publication # 2004/0003122 A1.**

Regarding claim 1, Hanchett teaches “**The management console 106 may display various retrieved data in a display. For example, the management console 106 may display details of the hierarchical network directory tree. The management console 106 alternatively or additionally enable the network administrator to select a node such as an end node and display applications under management for the selected node**” (col. 4 lines 32-44). (claim 1; i.e., displaying a hierarchical tree structure having one or more selectable tree nodes in a

graphical user interface, each of the one or more tree nodes representing a resource of an application server; receiving an indication that the monitor service tree node is selected; and displaying a monitor tree in the graphical user interface, the displayed monitor tree having one or more selectable monitor tree nodes,) Examiner interprets the management console to be a graphical user interface and the hierarchical network directory tree to have a hierarchical tree structure representing resources such as applications and devices.

Hanchett further teaches "**The end node 104, in conjunction with the directory server 102, may monitor and record systems properties**" (col. 4 lines 16-20). (claim 1; i.e., wherein at least one of the tree nodes is a monitor service tree node, the monitor service tree node representing a monitor service of the application server;) Examiner interprets the end node to be a monitor service tree node because the end node monitors systems properties.

Hanchett does not expressly teach a managed bean. However, Melillo teaches "**the Mbean wraps the non-Mbean making possible its management in the JMX architecture**"(abstract). (claim 1; i.e., wherein each of the one or more monitor tree nodes includes a monitor managed bean and an associated resource.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the non-complaint Mbean application resource as taught by Hanchett into a managed bean with the Mbean wrapper and to use the JMX adapter as taught by Melillo to enable the management console as taught by Hanchett to display the converted managed bean in a JMX architecture to provide the benefit of managing

objects representing different types of resources. (Hanchett; col. 11 lines 54-57) (Melillo; par. 2, par. 106-107)

Regarding claim 2, Hanchett does not expressly teach a status indicator. However, Melillo teaches “**In a management framework each resource is instrumented to enable access to corresponding information relating to the resource (such as data, events and status)**” (par. 18). (claim 2; i.e., wherein each displayed monitor tree node provides a status indicator to provide a current status of a monitored resource.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the non-compliant Mbean application resource as taught by Hanchett into a managed bean with the Mbean wrapper and to use the JMX adapter as taught by Melillo to enable the management console as taught by Hanchett to display the status of the converted managed bean in a management framework to provide the benefit of managing several kinds of resources such as stand-alone programs, client-server applications, Internet-based services, hardware devices, and the like. (Hanchett; col. 11 lines 54-57) (Melillo; par. 2, par. 18, par. 106-107)

Regarding claim 3, Hanchett teaches “**The management console 106 alternatively or additionally enable the network administrator to select a node such as an end node and display applications under management for the selected node etc... Any modifications to the control data may be made via the management console 106**” (col. 4 lines 35-44). (claim 3; i.e., receiving an indication that a monitor tree node is selected; and configuring the selected monitor tree node with

the graphical user interface.) Examiner interprets the administrator selecting end node as an indication that a monitor tree end node is selected. Modifying the control data of the end node is interpreted as configuring the data of the selected monitor tree node.

Regarding claim 4, Hanchett teaches **“Periodic timed updates performs checks to ensure that the data has not become stale”** (col. 11 lines 19-20). (claim 4; i.e., setting a monitoring period for the selected monitor tree node.) Examiner interprets the periodic timed updates of checking the policy data for the application represented by the selected end node to be a way of setting a monitoring period of the selected monitor tree node because checking periodically is another way of monitoring for a period.

Regarding claim 5, Hanchett teaches **“Event data, such as “Virus Found” and “File Cleaned,” may be sent by the agent of the node from the application under management”** (col. 8 lines 45-51). (claim 5; i.e., configuring the selected monitor tree node to provide an alarm if a resource associated with the selected monitor tree node malfunctions.) Examiner interprets the event data “Virus Found” as a type of alarm for a malfunctioned resource.

Regarding claim 7, Hanchett teaches **“Event data, such as “Virus Found” and “File Cleaned,” may be sent by the agent of the node from the application under management to the directory server 102 for storage. The end node 104 collects and stores the event data and sends the stored event data to the directory server 102 via the network 110”** (col. 8 lines 45-51). (claim 7; i.e., configuring the selected monitor tree node to push monitor data from a resource associated with the selected

monitor tree node to the selected monitor tree node.) Examiner interprets the application under management as a resource pushing event data to the agent of the end node. The selectable end node is configurable by the management console.

Claims 11 and 12 are directed towards system claims and are substantially encompassed in method claim 1; therefore the system claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claim 1 above. In respect to the graphical user interface, cursor control device and the Java Management extensions (JMX) of system claims 11 and 12, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the Management Console and mouse device as taught by Hanchett and the Java Management extensions (JMX) based architecture as taught by Melillo to perform the limitations of system claims 11 and 12 as further explained in the rationale of method claim 1 above. (see Hanchett Figure 4; mouse ref. #1011)

Claim 13 is directed towards a system claim and is substantially encompassed in method claim 3; therefore the system claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 3 above. In respect to the cursor control device and the window pane of system claim 13, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the Management Console and the mouse device as taught by Hanchett to perform the limitations of system claim 13 as further explained in the rationale of method claim 3 above. Examiner considers the Management Console to be a window based graphical user interface, therefore it is inherit for the information to be displayed in a windowpane. (see Hanchett Figure 4; mouse ref. #1011)

Regarding claim 14, Hanchett teaches “**a network directory defining a hierarchical tree structure containing nodes, each node corresponding to a device of the network of devices**” (col. 2 lines 50-55). (claim 14; i.e., wherein the displayed information includes at least one of a name of the selected monitor tree node, a description of the monitor tree node, a monitor type for the monitor tree node, and monitor data.) Examiner interprets the node corresponding to a device to be displayed as a device monitor type tree node.

Claim 21 is directed towards a system claim and is substantially encompassed in method claim 1; therefore the system claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 1 above. Claim 21 invokes the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112, therefore the corresponding structure elements for performing the means for displaying and receiving as recited in claim 21 are the computer client devices and management console illustrated in Hanchett’s Figure 1, respectfully.

Claim 22 is directed towards a system claim and is substantially encompassed in method claim 3; therefore the system claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 3 above. Claim 22 invokes the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112, therefore the corresponding structure elements for performing the means for receiving and configuring as recited in claim 22 are the management console and computer client devices illustrated in Hanchett’s Figure 1, respectfully.

Claim 23 is directed towards a system claim and is substantially encompassed in method claim 4; therefore the system claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 4 above. Claim 23 invokes the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112,

therefore the corresponding structure element for performing the means for setting as recited in claim 23 is the management console illustrated in Hanchett's Figure 1.

Claim 24 is directed towards a system claim and is substantially encompassed in method claim 5; therefore the system claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 5 above. Claim 24 invokes the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112, therefore the corresponding structure element for performing the means for configuring as recited in claim 24 is the management console illustrated in Hanchett's Figure 1.

Claims 27, 28, 29 and 30 are directed towards manufacture claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 respectfully; therefore the manufacture claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 above. In respect to the computer program of manufacture claims 27, 28, 29 and 30, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer program product as taught by Hanchett to perform the limitations of manufacture claims 27, 28, 29 and 30 as further explained in the rationale of method claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 above (see Hanchett col. 2 lines 44-59).

12. Claims 6, 8, 9, 10, 15-20, 25, 26, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanchett, in view of Melillo as cited and applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Kekic et al. (hereafter referred to as Kekic), U.S. Patent # 6,664,978 B1.

Regarding claim 6, neither Hanchett nor Melillo expressly teach to poll monitor data from a resource. However, Kekic teaches “polling events are proactive requests

made by management station 110 to elicit information from the agent. A common network management technique called "trap directed polling" is for the management station to wait for a trap event and then poll for more information regarding that event" (col. 4 lines 18-26, col. 38 lines 18-56). (claim 6; i.e., configuring the selected monitor tree node to poll monitor data from a resource associated with the selected monitor tree node.) Examiner interprets the graphical interface in Kekic's Figure 19B as a configuration means to poll monitor data from a resource.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the non-complaint Mbean application resource as taught by Hanchett into a managed bean with the Mbean wrapper and to use the JMX adapter as taught by Melillo to enable the management console as taught by Hanchett to configure a polling event to poll monitor data from a resource as taught by Kekic to provide the benefit of managing objects representing different types of resources while minimizing the impact of managed objects and network bandwidth (Hanchett; col. 11 lines 54-57) (Melillo; par. 2, par. 18, par. 106-107) (Kekic; col. 4 lines 18-26).

Regarding claim 8, neither Hanchett nor Melillo expressly teach setting a threshold value. However, Kekic teaches "**With client 391, the administrator can set up a set of rules within event rules 412 which say that the first time the threshold is passed, the port is put in the warning state and the polling rate is increased. If the port remains over the threshold for the rest of the minute, the port is put in the alarm state and an alarm is triggered" (col. 18 lines 46-55, Figure 24). (claim 8;**

i.e., setting a threshold value for the monitor tree node, wherein the monitor tree node is to provide an indication if the threshold value is detected.) Examiner interprets the threshold condition to contain a threshold value as shown in Kekic Figure 24.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the non-complaint Mbean application resource as taught by Hanchett into a managed bean with the Mbean wrapper and to use the JMX adapter as taught by Melillo to enable the management console as taught by Hanchett to configure a threshold condition which contains a threshold value as taught by Kekic to provide the benefit of saving the user from having to manually trigger alarms such as "Virus Found" for the different types of managed objects. Thus, setting the threshold condition would dramatically reduce the time and complexity of managing a computer network (Hanchett; col. 11 lines 54-57) (Melillo; par. 2, par. 18, par. 106-107) (Kekic; col. 18 lines 56-63).

Regarding claim 9, Hanchett teaches selectable end nodes (col. 4 lines 32-44). (claim 9; i.e., receiving an indication that a monitor tree node is selected;) Neither Hanchett nor Melillo expressly teach displaying a history of monitor data. However, Kekic teaches "**When the user activates button Alarms 312B, an alarm history log of all managed computer network elements in network 300 is displayed in work area 603**" (col. 22 lines 29-32). (claim 9; i.e., displaying a history of monitor data collected by the selected monitor tree node.) Examiner interprets the displayed alarm history log as displaying a history of monitor data collected.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the non-complaint Mbean application resource as taught by Hanchett into a managed bean with the Mbean wrapper and to use the JMX adapter as taught by Melillo to enable the management console as taught by Hanchett to display the alarm history log as taught by Kekic to provide the benefit of viewing the detailed history of the triggered alarms such as "Virus Found" for the different types of managed objects. Thus, displaying a history of the alarm log in a graphical interface such as the management console would dramatically reduce the time and complexity of managing a computer network (Hanchett; col. 11 lines 54-57) (Melillo; par. 2, par. 18, par. 106-107) (Kekic; Figure 31, col. 18 lines 56-63).

Regarding claim 10, neither Hanchett nor Melillo expressly teach displaying a table of monitor data. However, Kekic teaches "**Column: Date & Time and Description: Day and Time when the alarm occurred**" (col. 48 Table 7). (claim 10; i.e., displaying a table of monitor data, the displayed table including a time column to display a time when an item of monitor data is collected and one or more columns of monitor data.) Examiner interprets the table shown in Kekic's Figure 31 to have a time column and additional columns of monitor data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the non-complaint Mbean application resource as taught by Hanchett into a managed bean with the Mbean wrapper and to use the JMX adapter as taught by Melillo to enable the management console as taught by Hanchett to display the alarm history log the includes a time column as taught by

Kekic to provide the benefit of viewing the detailed history of the triggered alarms such as “Virus Found” for the different types of managed objects. Thus, displaying a time column in the history of the alarm log in a graphical interface such as the management console would dramatically reduce the time and complexity of managing a computer network due to the accuracy of the history log. (Hanchett; col. 11 lines 54-57) (Melillo; par. 2, par. 18, par. 106-107) (Kekic; Figure 31, col. 48 Table 7).

Regarding claim 15, Hanchett does teach selectable nodes that the network administrator can configure with the management console (col. 4 lines 32-44). (claim 15; i.e., a configuration command; and wherein as the cursor control device selects the configuration command) Neither Hanchett nor Melillo expressly teach a configuration pop-up window appearing in response to a selecting a configuration command. Kekic teaches “**Using panel 900 and in particular command buttons 903, the user can add an element manager, edit an existing element manager, copy an element manager, remove an element manager, or export an element manager etc...Upon activating button Add 903A, wizard panel 910 (FIG. 9B) is presented in work area 603**” (col.29 lines 11-24). (claim 15; a monitor tree node configuration pop-up window appears.) Examiner interprets the wizard panel 910 as a pop up window that appears when the configuration command 903A is selected by the cursor as shown in Kekic’s Figures 9A and 9B. The wizard panel 910 is used to build a element manager and to configure the network element that is interpreted to represent a monitoring tree node as illustrated in Kekic’s Figures 6A-C, 12A, 14A, and 14B.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the non-complaint Mbean application resource as taught by Hanchett into a managed bean with the Mbean wrapper and to use the JMX adapter as taught by Melillo to enable the management console as taught by Hanchett to display a configuration wizard panel as taught by Kekic to provide the benefit of reducing the complexity of managing and configuring objects representing different types of resources in a computer network. (Hanchett; col. 11 lines 54-57) (Melillo; par. 2, par. 106-107) (Kekic; col. 5 lines 2-7)

Regarding claim 16, neither Hanchett nor Melillo expressly teach a configuration pop-up window. However, **Kekic's Figure 14A and 14B displays a pop up configuration wizard panel that contains a drop down window and a check box that are selectable via the cursor control device.** (claim 16; i.e., wherein the configuration pop-up window provides one or more monitor tree node configuration options, the one or more monitor tree node configuration options selectable via the cursor control device.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the non-complaint Mbean application resource as taught by Hanchett into a managed bean with the Mbean wrapper and to use the JMX adapter as taught by Melillo to enable the management console as taught by Hanchett to display a pop up configuration wizard panel as taught by Kekic to provide the benefit of reducing the complexity of managing and configuring objects representing different

types of resources in a computer network. (Hanchett; col. 11 lines 54-57) (Melillo; par. 2, par. 106-107) (Kekic; col. 5 lines 2-7)

Regarding claim 17, neither Hanchett nor Melillo expressly teach configuration options. However, Kekic's Figures 24 and 26 illustrates the configuration pop up wizard panel to have a resource malfunction response indicator and a threshold value field, respectfully. (claim 17; i.e., wherein the one or more monitor tree node configuration options include at least one of a monitoring period field to receive a value specifying a monitoring period, a resource malfunction response indicator to specify a response of the monitor tree node, if a resource malfunctions, a data collection indicator to indicate whether monitor data is to be pushed from the resource, and a threshold value field to receive a threshold value for specifying a threshold of the resource.) Examiner interprets the value field under Frequency in Kekic's Figure 24 and "**the possible solution**" field in Kekic's Figure 26 and as the resource malfunction response indicator and threshold value field, respectfully.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the non-complaint Mbean application resource as taught by Hanchett into a managed bean with the Mbean wrapper and to use the JMX adapter as taught by Melillo to enable the management console as taught by Hanchett to display a pop up configuration wizard panel as taught by Kekic to provide the benefit of reducing the complexity of managing and configuring objects representing different types of resources in a computer network (Hanchett; col. 11 lines 54-57) (Melillo; par. 2, par. 106-107) (Kekic; col. 5 lines 2-7).

Regarding claim 18, neither Hanchett nor Melillo expressly teach displaying a history of monitor data. However, Kekic teaches “**The user can determine why the alarms button was activated by reviewing an alarm log that is presented in the graphic user interface upon the user activating the alarms button**” (col. 6 lines 3-6). (claim 18; i.e., a monitor data history command; and wherein as the cursor control device selects the monitor data history command, a monitor data history pop-up window appears, the monitor data history pop-up window to provide a history of monitor data collected by the monitor tree node.) Examiner interprets the alarm button in Kekic’s Figure 3B and the alarm log history in Figure 31 as the monitor data history command and the corresponding monitor data history pop-up window, respectfully.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the non-complaint Mbean application resource as taught by Hanchett into a managed bean with the Mbean wrapper and to use the JMX adapter as taught by Melillo to enable the management console as taught by Hanchett to display the alarm history log with the alarm button as taught by Kekic to provide the benefit of viewing the detailed history of the triggered alarms such as “Virus Found” for the different types of managed objects. Thus, displaying a history of the alarm log in a graphical interface such as the management console would dramatically reduce the time and complexity of managing a computer network (Hanchett; col. 11 lines 54-57) (Melillo; par. 2, par. 18, par. 106-107) (Kekic; Figure 31, col. 18 lines 56-63).

Claims 19 and 20 are directed towards system claims and are substantially encompassed in method claim 10; therefore the system claims are rejected under the

same rationale as method claim 10 above. In respect to the monitor data history pop-up window providing a table as recited system claims 19 and 20, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the table illustrated in Kekic's Figure 31 to perform the limitations of system claims 19 and 20 as further explained in the rationale of method claim 10 above.

Claim 25 is directed towards a system claim and is substantially encompassed in method claim 6; therefore the system claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 6 above. Claim 25 invokes the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112, therefore the corresponding structure element for performing the means for configuring as recited in claim 25 is the management console illustrated in Hanchett's Figure 1.

Claim 26 is directed towards a system claim and is substantially encompassed in method claim 8; therefore the system claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 8 above. Claim 26 invokes the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112, therefore the corresponding structure element for performing the means for setting as recited in claim 26 is the management console illustrated in Hanchett's Figure 1.

Claims 31 and 32 are directed towards manufacture claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 9 and 10 respectfully; therefore the manufacture claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 9 and 10 above. In respect to the computer program of manufacture claims 31 and 32, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer program product as taught by Hanchett to perform the limitations of manufacture claims

31 and 32 as further explained in the rationale of method claims 9 and 10 above (see Hanchett col. 2 lines 44-59).

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 274 1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Henry Orr
Examiner
Art Unit 2176

1/17/2006
HO

Henry Orr

H. Herndon
Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100